

REMARKS

The above complete listing of claims and these remarks are being submitted in response to the Office Action mailed November 16, 2004.

In the Action, the Examiner asserted that in the reply filed on 8/20/2004 the applicant did not list all claims readable on the elected species. However, a complete listing of claims was provided, including those which read on the elected species, i.e., claim 10 and claims 11-13 dependent thereon.

The Examiner asserted that in the reply filed on 8/20/2004 applicant did not state which claims read on elected species 7. However, applicant did so in the reply filed 8/20/2004, and herein restates that claim 10, believed to be generic and allowable, and dependent claims 11-13 read on species 7.

The Examiner asserted that applicant's selection of species 7 does not fully respond to the restriction requirement. Applicant respectfully points that species 7 was identified by the Examiner, and election thereof, made in the reply filed 8/20/2004, is believed to be fully responsive. Clarification is requested.

The preceding comments are thought to fully address the points raised by the Examiner in the Action of November 16, but the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if doing so will help advance the application to substantive examination.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
Customer Number 25763

Date: Dec 16, 2004

By: 
David E. Bruhn (Reg. No. 36,762)
Intellectual Property Department
Suite 1500, 50 South Sixth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1498
(612) 340-6317